

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 15-19 remain in the application and claims 1, 10, 11, 15, 16, and 18 have been amended hereby. Claim 14 has been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

The title of the invention has been changed to read -- GRAPHICAL USER INTERFACE UTILIZING A PLURALITY OF NODE PROCESSING MEANS FOR VIEW/DRAWING INCLUDING ANALYSIS, SELECTION, DISPLAY CONTROL, VIEW GENERATION AND RE-GENERATION--, as requested in the Office Action at paragraph 1.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-16, and 18 under 35 USC 102(e), as being anticipated by Hopcroft et al.

* Features of the Graphical User Interface (GUI) according to the present invention are that the view, providing a tree structure for defining how each node is viewed, is dynamically generated based on a history of views previously selected by a user. See the paragraph bridging pages 11 and 12 of the present application, for example.

Independent claims 1, 10, 15, 16, and 18 have been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

Looking at Hopcroft et al. we see that the view is not dynamically generated based on a history of views previously selected by a user. Hopcroft et al. is merely a Computer Aided Design (CAD) system wherein a first scene is created by a user for display and a second scene, transparent to the user, is produced representing the first scene for use by the computer system. The system of Hopcroft et al. is a CAD system whereas

the presently claimed invention is a GUI interface wherein the views are dynamically changed based on the user's behavior. Hopcroft et al. is silent about dynamically generating a view based on a history of views previously selected by a user.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 10, 15, 16, and 18, and the claims depending therefrom, are not anticipated by Hopcroft et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 8, 17, and 19 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Hopcroft et al. in view of Ishikawa.

Claims 8, 17, and 19 depend from claims 1, 16, and 18, respectively, which rejection over Hopcroft et al. has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Ishikawa that somehow could be combined with Hopcroft et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 8, 17, and 19 are patentably distinct over Hopcroft et al. in view of Ishikawa.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and is not seen to show or suggest the present invention as recited in the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP



Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM/PCF:pmc